# **EXHIBIT A**

# IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

| ALEXANDER THOMPSON,       | ) |                            |
|---------------------------|---|----------------------------|
| Plaintiff,                | ) |                            |
|                           | ) | Case No. 1:13-CV-00367-LPL |
| VS.                       | ) |                            |
|                           | ) |                            |
| NATIONAL FOOTBALL LEAGUE; | ) | (Filed Electronically)     |
| NFL FILMS, INC.; and NFL  | ) |                            |
| PRODUCTIONS, LLC,         | ) |                            |
|                           | ) |                            |
| Defendants.               | ) |                            |
| S                         | ) |                            |

DEFENDANTS' REPLY MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF THEIR MOTION TO TRANSFER PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a)

#### REPLY

This case raises the same claims and was filed by the same plaintiffs' counsel who also filed the *Tatum v. National Football League* case pending before this Court. In its reply brief filed today in *Tatum, see* Dkt. 18 Ex. A, *Tatum*, No. 2:13-CV-01814-LPL (W.D. Pa. Mar. 5, 2014), the NFL explains why that case and all of the opt-out litigation against the NFL should be transferred to the District of Minnesota, which managed the *Dryer* class case out of which all the opt-out litigation arose, and where the first-filed opt-out case is currently proceeding in litigation. Plaintiff does not dispute that his claims arose from *Dryer* and mirror those brought in *Tatum*. Nor does he contend that there is any reason to retain this case if *Tatum* is transferred. Indeed, Plaintiff's brief opposing transfer simply repeats verbatim most of the arguments made by the same counsel in their opposition brief in *Tatum. Compare* Pls.' Br. in Opp. to Transfer, Dkt. 19, *with* Pls.' Br. in Opp. to Transfer, *Tatum*, Dkt. 16 (Feb. 18, 2014). The arguments are unpersuasive here for the same reasons they are unpersuasive in *Tatum*. Accordingly, for the same reasons given by the NFL in its reply brief in *Tatum*, and to keep together these obvious companion cases, the NFL's motion to transfer should be granted.

## Respectfully submitted,

Dated: \_\_March 5, 2014

## /s/ Erin Lucas Hamilton

Charles B. Gibbons
Pa. 08284
charles.gibbons@bipc.com
Brian H. Simmons
Pa. 84187
brian.simmons@bipc.com
Erin Lucas Hamilton
Pa. 93852
erin.hamilton@bipc.com

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY One Oxford Centre 301 Grant Street, 20th Floor Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15219 (412) 562-8800 (412) 562-1041 (fax)

Daniel J. Connolly Aaron D. Van Oort FAEGRE BAKER DANIELS 2200 Wells Fargo Center 90 South Seventh Street Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402 (612) 766-7000

Bruce P. Keller Michael Schaper DEBEVOISE & PLIMPTON LLP 919 Third Avenue New York, New York 10022 (212) 909-6000

Attorneys for Defendants National Football League; NFL Films, Inc.; and NFL Productions, LLC